REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant responds herein to the Office Action dated January 4, 2007.

Claims 1-16 are pending in the instant application.

Rejection Under 35 USC § 102

In the most recent Office Action, claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as anticipated by Tomari (EP 1 148 423). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent claims 1, 2 and 6 each recite a portable terminal including a relating unit extracting one or more related electronic mails from a mail region based upon a relating conditions specified by an operation of a user to the electronic mail being displayed, and then displaying said one or more related electronic mails. Each of the independent claims 7-16 recite either a method, or a program for causing a computer to execute a method, including the step of extracting a related electronic mail from a mail region based upon a predetermined relating condition when a user commands display of the related mail. As examples only, the specification discloses, and the dependent and more tailored independent claims recite, that the relating conditions may include that a given address information is either the sender or receiver of the extracted electronic mail, or that the extracted electronic mail have a common subject. The Office Action asserts that these features are taught in Tomari. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Tomari, and particularly the cited portions thereof and the accompanying figures, teaches that when a user requests an information display list, history information for all stored items are displayed, including indications of any possible connections among various elements on the list. Tomari does not, however, extract or select related electronic mail based upon a condition of relation, and display the extracted mail. In the display taught by Tomari, there is no single connecting relationship among the stored items that motivates their extraction and display. The type of display shown in Tomari is precisely what the present invention avoids, i.e., a confused and cluttered display of all items. Rather, according to the present invention, mail that is related by the predetermined condition is extracted from the mail region, and the extracted mail is displayed to the user.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that all claims are distinguished over the applied references, and that the rejection has been overcome.

Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the application, allow the claims as amended and pass this case to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

THIS CORRESPONDENCE IS BEING
SUBMITTED ELECTRONICALLY
THROUGH THE UNITED STATES
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
EFS FILING SYSTEM
ON MARCH 14, 2007

MAX MOSKOWITZ
Registration No.: 30,576
OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP
1180 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-8403
Telephone: (212) 382-0700